RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

AUG 2 7 2007

Appl. No.: 10/711,921 Amdt. Dated: 8/27/2007

Reply to Office action of: 07/27/2007

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

In amended Figures 1-4 the drawings have had the shading removed from element 4 to clearly show the numeral, element 7 correctly identified, and to conform to USPTO drawing requirements. No other changes have been made to any of the figures.

Claims 2-14 and 18-20 remain in this application. Claims 1 and 15-17 have been canceled.

The Examiner has allowed claims 18-20. The Examiner has further acknowledged that claims 2-14 are directed to allowable subject matter. Claims 2-14 have been amended by this amendment to overcome the Examiner's objections.

The drawings were objected to because the reference numeral "7" is not very visible. The reference numeral "4" is not as bad, but could use some clearing up, as well.

By this amendment replacement sheets containing Figures 1 – 4 have been provided where the shading on all figures has been removed to make all numerals and especially numeral "4" clear and legible. Element "7" has been properly identified. No other changes have been made to any of the figures. In light of the changes to the drawings as presented in the replacement sheets the Examiner's objections have been overcome and Applicant respectfully requests they be removed.


Claims 5 and 9 were objected to because of informalities. Specifically, the Examiner states:

The words "conducting" (claim 5 and 9) and "through" (claim 9) are misspelled. Appropriate correction is required.


By this amendment the misspellings in claims 5 and 9 have been corrected. In light of these spelling correction of the word "conducting" in claims 5 and 9, as well as the spelling correction to the word "through" in claim 9, this objection is now believed to be most and removal of same is respectfully requested.


Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner states:

Regarding claim 15, the phrase "such as" (used twice) renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitations following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d). The Examiner



Appl. No. 10/711,921
Amdt. Dated August 27, 2007
Reply to Office action of July 27, 2007
Appotated Sheet Showing Changes





Appl. No.: 10/711,921 Amdt, Dated: 8/27/2007

Reply to Office action of: 07/27/2007

will interpret the claims as stating the first type is a power semiconductor device and the second type is a power switch.

By this amendment Claim 15 has been canceled. In light of the cancellation of Claim 15 this rejection is now moot and removal of same is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 15 – 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wood (2005/0029867) and Wilhelm (5,969,435). Specifically, the Examiner states:

Wood teaches a power system, applicable to an automotive vehicle, comprising first and second electrical power sources (22, 24) for feeding at least one electrical device (30), at least one rechargeable battery (82, 84) shared by the sources, a detection means for detecting the current and voltage throughout the system (50), at least one switching assembly (40a - d, 26) allowing the rechargeable battery and the sources to connect in any configuration, and an electronic system (50) associated with the detection means and controls the switching assemblies. Wood also teaches the switching devices being power semiconductor devices and power switches ([0051]). He also teaches the electronic system comprising a microprocessor and a series of associated electronic and logic circuits (54, 56, 58). ([0025], [0041], Figs. 2B & 3B) Wood fails to teach a specific method of having an uninterruptible supply of power to the loads. Welhelm teaches a system having two sources ("AC input" and "DC input") and a backup battery (25) shared by the sources (Fig. 4). He teaches a method where when only one transient electrical connection not exceeding a predetermined time period is required, the backup battery is connected to the loads via a switch (inside 23), and when an electrical connection of duration exceeding that of said predetermined time is required, another switch connects the other power source to the loads via a switch (inside 23). (Col. 3, lines 12-23; Col. 5, lines 43 - 52) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement Wilhelm's methods into Wood's power system so that the loads can be supplied with an uninterruptible supply of power, and therefore have no periods where power is needed and not supplied the loads.

By this amendment Claims 1 and 15 – 17 have been canceled. In light of this amendment the rejection is now moot and Applicants' respectfully request it be removed.

Appl. No.: 10/711,921 Amdt. Dated: 8/27/2007

Reply to Office action of: 07/27/2007

Claims 2-14 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

By this amendment claim 2 has been rewritten as necessary to make it an independent claim not depending from any rejected claim. Claims 3-14 now being dependent on an allowable independent claim are also in condition for allowance. In light of these amendments to claims 2-14 these claims are now in condition for a notice of allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

Claims 18 – 20 have been allowed by the Examiner.

In view of the remarks herein, and the amendments hereto, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance, and such action and issuance of a timely Notice of Allowance is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Bruce E. Harang

Registration No. 29,720

Tel.: (360) 903-4693

Bure & Haran

Attachments